UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,461	12/04/2003	John D. Shaughnessy	D6485	6235

7590 09/14/2006

Benjamin Aaron Adler
ADLER & ASSOCIATES
8011 Candle Lane
Houston, TX 77071

EXAMINER	
FETTEROLF, BRANDON J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,461	SHAUGHNESSY, JOHN D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15,18 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15 and 18-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/10/2006 has been entered.

Claims 15 and 18-19 are currently pending and under consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: how the expression level is examined. In the instant case, it is unclear what steps are involved in the examination of the level of the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 protein.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the claims are inclusive of a genus of compounds referred to as "WNT antagonist". Therefore, the claims encompass a genus of molecules defined solely by its principal biological property, which is simply a wish to know the identity of any material with that biological property. However, the written description in this case only sets forth two species of WNT antagonist, wherein said antagonist is soluble frizzled related protein 3 (SFRP-3/FRZB) or the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 (DKK1).

The Written Description Guidelines for examination of patent applications indicates, "the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical characteristics and/or other chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicant was in possession of the claimed genus." (Federal register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3) and (see MPEP 2164).

The specification teaches (page 24, line 18 to page 25, line 6) that specific WNT signaling antagonists of the invention include, but are not limited to, compounds which are expressed in a multiple myeloma patient, wherein the increased expression of the antagonist compared to that in a normal individual indicates that the patient has a potential of developing bone disease. The specification further provides (page 19, lines 13-20) examples of secreted antagonists of WNT such as Frizzled (Fz)-related proteins (FRPs), Cerberus, Wnt inhibitor factory (WIF) and Dickkopf (DKK). However, the written description (specification, page 39) only reasonably conveys two species of WNT antagonists (DKK-1 and FRZP) linked to lytic bone lesions in multiple myeloma patients; and therefore, is not commensurate with any and/or all WNT signaling antagonist. Accordingly, there is insufficient written description encompassing a "Wnt antagonist associated lytic bone disease" because the relevant identifying characteristics of the genus such as structure or other physical and/or chemical characteristics of a "Wnt antagonist" are not set forth in the specification as-filed. A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or by describing structural

features common the genus that "constitute a substantial portion of the genus." See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 1568, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997): "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cNDA, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus."

The court has since clarified that this standard applies to compounds other than cDNAs. See University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., Inc., __F.3d__,2004 WL 260813, at *9 (Fed.Cir.Feb. 13, 2004). Some of the factual considerations that are weighed when determining a written description include the level of skill and knowledge in the art, the disclosure of complete or partial structures, the disclosure of physical and or chemical properties, adequate disclosure of the functional characteristics, the correlation between structure and function, and disclosure of methods of making. In the instant case, the specification (page 39) only adequately describes the complete chemical, structural, and functional properties of two species of WNT signaling antagonists (DKK-1 and FRZP) linked to lytic bone lesions in multiple myeloma patients. The specification does not disclose that any of the other WNT signaling antagonists such as Cerberus and Wnt inhibitor factory (WIF), will be expressed in a multiple myeloma patient with a bone disease. The Office has published a synopsis of written description guidelines (www.uspto.gov/web/menu/written.pdf) with particular emphasis on the claiming of a genus with wide varying species (see pages 7-9, Decision Tree). Thus, the instant specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features that are common to the genus. That is, the specification provides neither a representative number of antagonists that encompass the genus of WNT signaling antagonists, which are expressed in a myeloma patient with a bone disease, nor does it provide a description of structural features that are common to the antagonists. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, the disclosure of two species of WNT signaling antagonist is insufficient to describe the genus. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe and enable the genus as broadly claimed.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure(s) of the encompassed genus of antagonists, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only two species of WNT signaling antagonists (DKK-1 and FRZP), wherein the WNT antagonist are linked to lytic bone lesions in multiple myeloma patients, but not the full breadth of the claims, meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Claims 15 and 18-19 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of diagnosing a Dkk-1 associated lytic bone disease in an individual having multiple myeloma, comprising examining the expression level of the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 (DKK-1) protein, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of diagnosing any and/or all Wnt antagonist-associated lytic bone diseases in any test individual, comprising examining the expression level of the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 (DKK-1) protein in said test individual. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in Wands states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' " (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the relative skill of those in the art, (3) the breadth of the claims, (4) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (5) the presence or absence of working examples, (6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (7) the state of the prior art, and (8) the predictability or unpredictability of the art.

Although the quantity of experimentation alone is not dispositive in a determination of whether the required experimentation is undue, this factor does play a central role. For example, a very limited quantity of experimentation may be undue in a fledgling art that is unpredictable where no guidance or working examples are provided in the specification and prior art, whereas the same amount of experimentation may not be undue when viewed in light of some guidance or a working example or the experimentation required is in a predictable established art. Conversely, a large quantity of experimentation would require a correspondingly greater quantum of guidance, predictability and skill in the art to overcome classification as undue experimentation. In Wands, the determination that undue experimentation was not required to make the claimed invention was based primarily on the nature of the art, and the probability that the required experimentation would result in successfully obtaining the claimed invention. (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1406) Thus, a combination of factors which, when viewed together, would provide an artisan of ordinary skill in the art with an expectation of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation would preclude the classification of that experimentation as undue. A combination of Wands factors, which provide a very low likelihood of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation, however, would render the additional experimentation undue.

The nature of the invention

The claims are drawn to a method of diagnosing a Wnt antagonist-associated lytic bone diseases in a test individual, comprising examining the expression level of the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 (DKK-1) protein in said test individual. The invention is in a class of invention which the CAFC has characterized as "the unpredictable arts such as chemistry and biology." Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 243 F.3d 1316, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

Level of skill in the art

The level of skill in the art is deemed to be high, generally that of a PhD or MD.

The breadth of the claims

Applicants broadly claim a method of diagnosing a Wnt antagonist-associated lytic bone diseases in a test individual, comprising examining the expression level of the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 (DKK-1) protein in said test individual. Thus, the claims encompass diagnosing any and/or all Wnt antagonist –associated lytic bone disease in any individual based on the increased expression of Dickkopf-1 (DKK-1) protein.

Guidance in the specification and Working Examples

The specification teaches (page 19, lines 13-20) that examples of secreted antagonists of WNT such as Frizzled (Fz)-related proteins (FRPs), Cerberus, Wnt inhibitor factory (WIF) and Dickkopf (DKK). The specification further teaches that 174 patients with "newly" diagnosed multiple myeloma, 16 patients with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance, 9 with Waldenstroms macroglobulinemia, and 45 normal persons were studied in the present invention (page 27, lines 10-16). Specifically, the specification provides (page 35, Example 8) an analysis of the results obtained from 173 patients with myeloma, wherein the DKK1 signal for patients with 1 + MRI and no x-ray lesion differ significantly compared to patients with no MRI and no x-ray lesions, but does not differ significantly compared to patients with 1 + MRI and 1 + x-ray. Moreover, the specification teaches (page 9, Example 9) a correlation between global gene expression of DKK-1 and lytic bone lesions in multiple myeloma. Thus, while the specification clearly teaches a diagnosis of bone disease in a multiple myeloma patient comprising comparing the level of DKK-1 expression

in an individual with multiple myeloma compared to a "normal" individual, the specification appears to be silent on a correlation between DKK-1 expression and any and/or all Wnt antagonist-associated lytic bone diseases in any and/or all individuals. As such, if there is no correlation then the examples do not constitute working examples. While it is understood that the absence of working examples should never be the sole reason for rejecting a claims as being broader than an enabling disclosure, the criticality of working examples in an unpredictable art, such as the diagnosis of a bone disease, is required for practice of the claimed invention.

Quantity of experimentation

The quantity of experimentation in the areas of diagnosis is extremely large given the unpredictability associated with correlating the level of DKK-1 protein expression level with the ability to provide a diagnostic evaluation of a patient suspected of exhibiting a lytic bone disorder.

The unpredictability of the art and the state of the prior art

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could recognize that one activity associated with the DKK family of proteins is the modulation, e.g., antagonism, of the activity of the Wnt family of secreted proteins. For example, McCarthy (WO 00/52047, 2000, of record), teach a method of diagnosing a disease or disorder associated with aberrant expression or activity of DKK (abstract). While McCarthy contemplates determining the risk of developing a disease associated with aberrant expression or activity of a DKK protein (page 96, lines 14-16), there does not appear to be any demonstration that the DKK family of proteins can be used to diagnose a WNT associated lytic bone disease in any and/or all individuals.

In the instant case, the specification provides neither guidance on nor exemplification of how to correlate the level of DKK-1 protein expression level with the ability to provide a diagnostic evaluation of a patient suspected of exhibiting a lytic bone disorder. Tockman et al (Cancer Res., 1992, 52:2711s-2718s) teach considerations necessary in bringing a cancer biomarker (intermediate end point marker) to successful clinical application. Although the reference is drawn to biomarkers for cancer detection, the basic principles taught are clearly applicable to other disorders such as lytic bone diseases. Tockman et al teaches that prior to the successful application of newly described markers, research must validate the markers against acknowledged disease end points, establish

quantitative criteria for marker presence/absence and confirm marker predictive value in prospective population trials (see abstract). Early stage markers of carcinogenesis have clear biological plausibility as markers of preclinical cancer and **if validated** (emphasis added) can be used for population screening (p. 2713s, col 1). The reference further teaches that once selected, the sensitivity and specificity of the biomarker must be validated to a known (histology/cytology-confirmed) cancer outcome. The essential element of the validation of an early detection marker is the ability to test the marker on clinical material obtained from subjects monitored in advance of clinical cancer and *link* those marker results with subsequent histological confirmation of disease. This irrefutable link between antecedent marker and subsequent acknowledged disease is the essence of a valid intermediate end point marker (p. 2714, see Biomarker Validation against Acknowledged Disease End Points). Clearly, prior to the successful application of newly described markers, markers must be validated against acknowledged disease end points and the marker predictive value must be confirmed in prospective population trials (p. 2716s, col 2). In addition, Slamon et al. (Science Vol. 235, January 1987, pages 177-182) teach other essential factors that are known to be important in the prognosis of breast cancer in individual patients such as size of the primary tumor, stage of the disease at diagnosis, hormonal receptor status, and number of axillary lymph nodes involved with disease (page 178, 1st column, 2nd paragraph). Such data are critical to assessing actuarial curves for relapse (Figure 3), and for comparing disease-free survival and overall survival to prognostic factors (Table 4).

Conclusion

Thus given the broad claims in an art whose nature is identified as unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the lack of guidance in the specification, and the negative teachings in the prior art balanced only against the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to perform the method of the claim as written.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible

harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 15 and 18-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of copending Application No. 10/176,739.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a species anticipates a genus. The genus method of determining the potential of developing bond disease in a multiple myeloma patient by examining the expression level of a WNT signaling antagonist claimed in the conflicting patent application appears to fall within the same scope as the species method of diagnosing a Wnt antagonist-associated lytic bone disease in a patient comprising examining the expression level of the human homologue of Dickkopf-1 (DKK-1) protein claimed in the application being examined.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Therefore, NO claim is allowed

All other rejections and/or objections are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and arguments there to.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF

JEFFREY SIEW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER